



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/748,487

12/29/2003

Joseph Olakangil

134147

8737

35114

7590

05/29/2008

ALCATEL LUCENT
(FKA ALCATEL INTERNETWORKING, INC.)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2
PLANO, TX 75075

EXAMINER

QURESHI, AFSAR M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/748,487	Applicant(s) OLAKANGIL ET AL.	
	Examiner AFSAR M. QURESHI	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to RCE, Argument and Remarks received on 4/28/2008. Applicant canceled claim 13 and amended claim 3.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant amended claim 3 by excluding two fields of the PDU, source address and destination address from a group of fields and repeated same arguments as previously presented, dated 3/17/2008. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees with the argument that Li uses the same index (table) to select an action. The first index and the second index of Li are not used together simultaneously or as pair of selecting an action.

In addition to 'response to arguments' (Final Rejection 1/17/2008) Examiner maintains both 'src' and 'dst' parameters are needed for selecting an action (see fig. 8) wherein table 60 is the first index and table 62 is second index (col. 9, lines 36 through col. 10, lines 1-24).

As to claim 23, Examiner maintains that Yazaki discloses generating first string and second string, SIP, DIP (see col. 15, lines 38-44 and col. 17, lines 61-65, see figure 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "*the* group" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 18, 19, 20 and 21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form as dependent on cancelled claim 13. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1-12, 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US 6,567,408, Hereinafter, Li).

As for claim 1, Li shows (a) generating a first string (**src**) and a second string (**dst**) with which to characterize the PDU (**Col. 10 line 25-27**); (b) determining a first index associated with the first string and a second index associated with the second string (**Col. 10 line 28-40**), wherein the first index and second index are selected from a plurality of indices (**Col. 10 line 28-40**); and (c) selecting an action from a plurality of actions based on the first index and the second index (**Col. 10 line 28-40 and col. 11, lines 10-27**), each action being associated with two indices of the plurality of indices (**Col. 10 line 28-40**).

As for claim 2, Li shows PDU has one field (i.e. **Source address/destination address, Col. 7 line 35-50**) and the first string and second string each comprise one bit derived from the one fields of the PDU (**Col. 10 line 25-27**).

As for claim 3, Li shows the one field is selected from the group consisting of: network layer protocol (**Col. 7, lines 35-53**) and other network protocols (col. 16, lines 37-52)

As for claim 4, Li shows wherein the first string comprises one bits selected from a destination address field of the PDU (**Col. 10, lines 25-27**).

As for claim 5, Li shows the second string comprises one bits selected from a source address field of the PDU (**Col. 10, lines 25-27**).

As for claim 6, Li shows generating the plurality of actions from policies that characterize a plurality of traffic flows (**Col. 12, lines 55-60**).

As for claim 7, Li shows using the indices as keys into a memory device (**Col. 9, lines 15-18**) comprising the plurality of actions (**Col. 10, lines 40-44**).

As for claim 8, Li shows instructions passing the PDU to a PDU destination address and instructions to filter the PDU (**Col. 6, lines 19-23, and Col. 7 lines 49**).

As for claim 9, Li shows one pointer to one instruction defining the manner in which to process the PDU (**Col. 12, lines 55-68**).

As for claim 10, Li shows the PDU has one fields (**Col. 7, lines 35-50**) and the step of determining a first index and the second index further comprises the step of searching a tree (**Col. 9, lines 64**), wherein one fields of the PDU are compared against the nodes of the tree (**Col. 10, lines 27-40**).

As for claim 11, Li shows the tree is a Patricia trie (**Col. 9, lines 64**).

As for claim 12, Li shows a string generator for generating a first string (src) and a second string (**dst**) with which to characterize the PDU (**Col. 10 line 27**); and (b) an index allocate for retrieving a first index associated with the first string (**Col. 10 line 2740**) and a second index associated with the second string, wherein the first index and second index are selected from a plurality of indices (**Col. 7 lines 27-40**); and (c) Li shows a memory device (**Memory within ESP24**), operatively coupled to the index allocate (**Col. 9, line 15-20**), comprising a plurality of actions, each action being selected based on two indices of the plurality of indices (**Col. 10 line 27-40**).

As for claim 14, Li shows the first string (src) and second string (dst) each comprise one bit derived from one field of the PDU (**Col. 7 lines 35-50**) and (**Col. 10 lines 25-27**).

As for claim 15, Li shows the one field is selected from the group consisting of: a

source address (**Col. 7 lines 35-50**).

As for claim 16, Li shows the first string comprises one bit selected from a destination address field of the PDU (**Col. 10 lines 25-27**).

As for claim 17, Li shows the second string comprises one bit selected from a source address field of the PDU (**Col. 10 lines 25-27**).

As for claim 18, Li shows the plurality of actions is derived from policies that characterize a plurality of traffic flows (**Col. 12 lines 55-60**).

As for claim 19, Li shows the plurality of indices is keys into the memory device (**Col. 9 lines 15-18**).

As for claim 20, Li shows instructions for passing the PDU to a PDU destination address and instructions to filter the PDU (**Col. 6 lines 19-23 and Col. 7 line 49**).

As for claim 21, Li shows the actions further comprise one or more pointers to one instruction defining the manner in which to process the PDU (**Col. 12 lines 55-68**).

As for claim 22, Li shows the index allocates comprises a trie (**Col. 9 lines 64**), the trie comprising nodes against which one field of the PDU are compared (**Col. 10 line 27-40**).

6. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yazaki et al. (US 6,768,738, Hereinafter, Yazaki).

As for claim 23, Yazaki shows generating a first string (**Sip**) from source

information associated with the PDU (**Col. 15 line 40-44**); (b) generating a second string (DIP) from destination information associated with the PDU (**Col. 15 line 40-44**); (c) identifying a first QoS action from a plurality of QoS actions based on the first string (**Col. 15 line 40-44**); (d) identifying a second QoS action from a plurality of QoS actions based the second string (**Col. 16 line 20-25**); and (e) determining a final QoS action from at least one of the first and second QoS actions (**Col. 16 line 27-28**).

As for claim 24, Yazaki shows applying a hierarchical rule indicating which one of the first and second QoS actions has precedence (**Col. 16 lines 27-28, figure 14**).

7. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yazaki in view of Tuck, III et al. (US 7,107,352, Hereinafter, Tuck).

As for claim 25, Yazaki does not show one of the first and second QoS actions is a PDU pass action recommending that the PDU be forwarded, and one of the QoS actions is a PDU drop action recommending that the PDU be filtered. However, Tuck shows PDU pass action recommending that the PDU be forwarded (**Figure 2, Col. A row 1 show a pass**), and one of the QoS actions is a PDU drop action recommending that the PDU be filtered (**figure 2, Col. D row 1 show a drop**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify filtering of Yazaki with the pass/drop function of Tuck in order to indicate the QoS function of different devices in the network.

As for claim 26, Yazaki does not show wherein the hierarchical rule indicates that the PDU drop action has precedence over the PDU pass action. However, Tuck shows the hierarchical rule indicates that the PDU drop action has precedence over the PDU pass action (**Figure 2, Col. A row 1 shows a pass, Col. D row 1 shows a drop, and Col. PASS/DROP shows a drops, therefore drop action take precedence over pass function**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the QoS function of Yazaki with Pass/Drop precedence of Tuck in order to relieve congestion of a receiving device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AFSAR M. QURESHI whose telephone number is (571)272-3178. The examiner can normally be reached between 8 am to 5 pm (Monday – Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Field Lynn can be reached on (571) 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Afsar M Qureshi/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2616

5/24/2008